

From: Daniel M. Dreifus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 11/19/01 8:46am
Subject: Microsoft antitrust settlement

I was very disappointed to see the DOJ vs. Microsoft case proposed for settlement without meaningful reformation.

I believe it has become nearly impossible for new companies to truly innovate by introducing products that would compete with Microsoft.

Wasn't the purpose of the original action to create an environment where competition could be fostered without the domination of the technological field by a single player?

I am concerned that Microsoft will own and control all aspects of the Internet.

I do not trust their benevolence to manage it for the public good.

While it should not be the role of government to do so, as Americans we trust the free enterprise system of competition to offer reasonable alternatives to consumers.

I just don't understand - monopoly power was demonstrated as a finding of fact, then no credible action was taken to counter its continued dominance.

It is my opinion that Judge Jackson, even with the years of experience on the bench, and scholarly restraint, found it impossible to contain himself after witnessing the patently false and outrageous claims put forth by the defendant. I am certain the press was constantly pressuring him for comment.

I do not believe he entered the trial with prejudice, but that his opinion was formed during presentation of the evidence.

Please consider meaningful reform in the Microsoft case. I do not believe they have excelled through innovation, but through bullying competitors into oblivion with threat and intimidation.

Commercial Resource Management
Daniel M. Dreifus
Toll free: 888 716-0672
Fax: 805 584-8348
e-mail: crm3@ix.netcom.com